



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,916	03/15/2004	Ryan C. Hoth	PHOTRC	3086
7590 Thompson E. Fehr Suite 300 Goldenwest Corporate Center 5025 Adams Avenue Ogden, UT 84403			EXAMINER SILBERMANN, JOANNE	
			ART UNIT 3611	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/02/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/801,916

Applicant(s)

HOTH, RYAN C.

Examiner

Joanne Silberman

Art Unit

3611

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 7-9 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6, 10-13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on March 9, 2008. These drawings are not accepted.

The original disclosure does not provide support for the linear segment as shown in new Figure 4. Specifically, the original disclosure only supports the linear segment as being releasably attached to the primary section. Original Figure 3 does not show a longitudinal segment of the primary section as being separable to form the linear segment as now shown in Figure 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson, US #4,525,946.
4. Olson discloses a holder including a base having first and second ends and first and second perpendicular segments 40, 42 extending therefrom. Cylindrical rod 30 includes a primary section having first end 44 passing through aperture 46 in segment 40 and second end 48 passing through aperture 50 in segment 42 (Figure 6). Linear segment 16 (Figure 2) is releasably attached to the primary section. First end 32 is shaped in the form of a knob.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson in view of Elmer, US #5,711,100.

7. Olson does not specifically teach a means for removably retaining the holder on a vehicle, particularly including magnets, however this is well known in the art as shown by Elmer. Elmer teaches mounting a display on a vehicle including magnets 138 (Figure 1A). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to utilize magnets on the base of Olson so as to provide a retaining means that is secure yet removable.

8. Claims 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson in view of Reyer, US #1,320,918.

9. Olson does not teach the use of countersunk apertures or a drawer in the base. However, countersunk apertures are well known and are considered to be an obvious equivalent alternative to any mounting means suggested by Olson. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize such apertures as an equivalent retaining means for the base.

10. It is also well known to provide a drawer in a holder, such as a desk or other piece of furniture. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

provide a drawer in the base of Olson so that other articles may be conveniently held nearby, as is the purpose of a drawer.

11. Olson also does not teach spring clips attached to the base, however this is well known as shown by Reyer. Reyer teaches spring clips 11 mounted to a holder. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to utilize such spring clips on the base of Olson so that articles may be held on the base, as is taught by Reyer.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 3-6 and 10-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joanne Silbermann whose telephone number is 571-272-6653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on 571-272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joanne Silberman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3611

/Joanne Silberman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3611
14.